



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,004	10/24/2001	Joseph S. Lombardo	1557-SPL	5936

7590 03/03/2006

Francis A Cooch
The Johns Hopkins University
Applied Physics Laboratory
11100 John Hopkins Road
Laurel, MD 20723-6099

EXAMINER

LE, LINH GIANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 03/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/030,004

Applicant(s)

LOMBARDO ET AL.

Examiner

Linh-Giang Le

Art Unit

3626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 7 and 18 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 March 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant

1. The communication is in response to the application filed 7 March 2001. Claims 1-20 are pending. Acknowledgement is made of the claim of benefit of the International Application No. PCT/US01/07125, filed 7 March 2001, which claims the benefit of the U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/187,521 filed 7 March 2000.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 7 and 18 are objected to because of the following informalities: incorrect spelling. Dosimetrist is spelled incorrectly in the claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-3 and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pinsky et al. (5,469,353).

Art Unit: 3626

5. As per claim 1, Pinsky discloses a method for interactive medical treatment planning involving multiple participants using multiple treatment planning stations, comprising the steps of (Pinsky; Abstract):

- a. Establishing one of said treatment planning stations as a session controller, and launching treatment planning software thereon (Pinsky; Col. 11, lines 35-40);
- b. Establishing a communication connection between said session controller and launching treatment planning software thereon (Pinsky; Col. 5, lines 55-66);
- c. Displaying, on all participating treatment planning stations, treatment plan information being displayed on said session controller treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 6, lines 24-33).

6. As per claim 2, Pinsky discloses designating one of said treatment planning stations as an active controller, said active controller controlling manipulation of said treatment planning information (Pinsky; Col. 2; lines 6-20).

7. As per claim 3, Pinsky discloses said active control of said treatment planning station is regulated by said session controller treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 2, lines 6-20).

Art Unit: 3626

8. As per claim 12, Pinsky discloses a method for interactive medical treatment planning involving multiple participants using multiple treatment planning stations, comprising the steps of (Pinsky; Abstract):

- a. Means for establishing one of said treatment planning stations as a session controller, and launching treatment planning software thereon (Pinsky; Col. 11, lines 35-40);
- b. Means for establishing a communication connection between said session controller and launching treatment planning software thereon (Pinsky; Col. 5, lines 55-66);
- c. Means for displaying, on all participating treatment planning stations, treatment plan information being displayed on said session controller treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 6, lines 24-33).

9. As per claim 13, Pinsky discloses a means for designating one of said treatment planning stations as an active controller, said active controller controlling manipulation of said treatment planning information (Pinsky; Col. 6, lines 32-33).

10. As per claim 14, Pinsky discloses said active control of said treatment planning station is regulated by said session controller treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 2, lines 6-20).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 3626

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 4-11 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pinsky et al (5,469,353) in view of Henderson (5,897,648), Peltz (6,205,716) and Ellis (US 2005/0180095 A1).

13. As per claim 4, Pinsky discloses:

- a. Generation of an active-control request by a treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 2, lines 6-20).
- b. Processing of said active-control request by said session controller treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 2; lines 6-20);

However, Pinsky fails to disclose authorizing or denying said active-control request by said session controller treatment planning station, wherein if said active-control request is granted, said treatment planning station generating said active-control request is given active control of said treatment planning station, and if said active-control request is denied, said treatment planning station generating said active-control request is denied active-control of said treatment planning session. However, this

Art Unit: 3626

feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Henderson. In particular, Henderson teaches passing editing controls to various locations (Henderson; Col. 11, lines 57-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of authorizing or denying an active-control request to the method disclosed in Pinsky in order to give one particular editing location the ability to control electronic documents at all locations (Henderson; Col. 11, lines 57-67). One skilled in the art could infer that passing around control would include authorizing or denying an active-control request.

14. As per claim 5, Pinsky discloses at least two of said treatment planning stations located in geographically diverse locations (Pinsky; Col. 1, lines 6-12).

15. As per claim 6, Pinsky discloses conference calling capabilities but fails to expressly disclose each of said treatment planning station to include video conferencing capability, and further comprising the step of transmitting video and audio signals using said video conferencing capability of said treatment planning stations so that participants to said treatment planning session can see and hear the other participants in the session while the session is in progress. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Peltz. In particular, Peltz discloses a video conferencing enclosure for conducting medical matters (Peltz; Abstract). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the video conferencing feature taught by Peltz to the method disclosed in Pinsky with the motivation of providing an interactive electronic

Art Unit: 3626

means for healthcare professionals to train and educate (Peltz; Col. 1, line 65 to Col. 2, line 4).

16. As per claim 7, Pinsky discloses said treatment planning session is for planning radiation therapy and said participants in said treatment planning session include at least a dosimetrist and a radiation oncologist, each located at geographically diverse location (Pinsky; Col.1, lines 28-36).

17. As per claim 8, Pinsky discloses said treatment planning stations are coupled to each other via a network connection (Pinsky; Col. 7, lines 31-41).

18. As per claim 9, Pinsky discloses said network connection comprising the Internet (Pinsky; Col. 7, lines 31-41).

19. As per claim 10, Pinsky, does not expressly disclose said network connection comprising the Next Generation Internet or other high bandwidth connection. However this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Ellis. In particular Ellis teaches computers utilizing a very large network like the Next Generation Internet (Ellis; Page 3, paragraph 23). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the Next Generation Internet feature taught by Ellis to the method disclosed in Pinsky with the motivation of having extremely broad band-width connections and virtually unlimited data transmission speed (Pinsky; Page 3, paragraph 23).

20. As per claim 11, Pinsky does not expressly disclose said manipulation of said treatment plan information including at least one of contouring, rotating, or pointing at locations in images being displayed on said treatment planning stations and inputting treatment area and treatment dosage information into said treatment planning software. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Henderson. In particular, Henderson teaches being able to make edits at remote locations (Henderson; Col. 3, lines 1-22 and Col. 10, line 49 to Col. 11, line 12). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to add the editing feature taught by Henderson to the method in Pinsky with the motivation of interacting with a document that will be displayed at multiple locations (Pinsky; col. 3, lines 1-22).

21. As per claim 15, Pinsky discloses a designating means including:

- a. Means for generation of an active-control request by a treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 2, lines 32-33 and Col. 8, line 54 to Col. 9, line 8).
- b. Means for processing of said active-control request by said session controller treatment planning station (Pinsky; Col. 11, lines 35-40);

Pinsky does not expressly disclose means for authorizing or denying said active-control request by said session controller treatment planning station, wherein if said active-control request is granted, said treatment planning station generating said active-control request is given active control of said treatment planning station, and if said active-control request is denied, said treatment planning station generating said active-

Art Unit: 3626

control request is denied active-control of said treatment planning session (Pinsky; Col. 11, lines 35-40). However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Henderson. In particular, Henderson teaches a means for passing editing controls to various locations (Henderson; Col. 11, 57-67 and Col. 12, lines 18-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of a means for authorizing or denying an active-control request to the method disclosed in Pinsky in order to give one particular editing location the ability to control electronic documents at all locations (Henderson; Col. 11, lines 57-67). One skilled in the art could infer that passing around control would include a means for authorizing or denying an active-control request.

22. Claims 16-20 recite the same features as claims 5-9 and are rejected for the same reasons as stated earlier.

Conclusion

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The cited but not applied prior art teaches a system and method for prompt-radiology image screening service via satellite (6,137,527); systems and methods for direct image manipulation (US 2002/0054172 A1); picture and archiving communication system (6,574,629); teleradiology systems for rendering and visualizing remotely-located volume data sets (US 6,621,918 B1); remote access medical image


Art Unit: 3626

exchange system and methods of operation therefor (6,006,191); teleradiology system (5,291,401); and telepathology diagnostic network (5,216,596).

24. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Linh-Giang "Michelle" Le whose telephone number is 571-272-8207. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 5PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JOSEPH THOMAS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER